

Appl. No. 10/032,184
Reply to Office Action of July 19, 2005

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Office Action dated July 19, 2005. Claims 1, 14-18, 52 and 61-63 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 14 and 52 have been amended. No new matter has been added by any of the amendments made herein. Claims 1, 14-18, 52 and 61-63 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections are improper at least for the reasons set forth below.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 14-18 and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,173,209 issued to Laval et al. ("Laval"). Applicants believe that Laval, on its own, is distinguishable from the claimed invention as defined by claims 1, 14-18 and 52. Of the pending claims at issue, claims 1, 14 and 52 are the sole independent claims.

Independent claim 1 is directed to an electronic ticket management system having: an event organizer apparatus for generating event information; an electronic ticket distribution authentication apparatus for distributing electronic ticket information via Internet that authenticates a right to attend the event, said electronic information further including a plurality of attendee information; an information storage chip for storing the electronic ticket information; an electronic ticket platform center for managing the distribution of the electronic ticket information, wherein the event organizer apparatus registers the generated event information in the electronic ticket platform center; said electronic ticket distribution authentication apparatus authenticates whether the electronic ticket information is to be distributed to a user of the information storage chip be receiving a request for distribution of the electronic ticket information from the user, and registers an authentication result in the electronic ticket platform center as ticket issuing information; and said electronic ticket platform center generates an electronic ticket information master based on the event information registered by the event organizer apparatus, and performs ticket issuing processing for writing the electronic ticket information into the information storage chip based on the ticket issuing information, said ticket issuing information being registered in the electronic ticket distribution authentication apparatus based on the generated ticket information master.

Independent claim 14 is directed to a method for electronic ticket distribution authentication having: generating event information at an event organizer apparatus; registering generated event information in an electronic ticket platform center; receiving a request, at an

Appl. No. 10/032,184
Reply to Office Action of July 19, 2005

electronic ticket distribution authentication apparatus, to distribute electronic ticket information via Internet concerning events from a user of an information storage chip, said electronic ticket information further including a plurality of attendee information; performing distribution authentication processing for determining whether the registered electronic ticket information is to be distributed to the requesting user; registering an authentication result in the electronic ticket platform center for managing the distribution of the electronic ticket information as ticket issuing information; generating an electronic ticket information master and performs ticket issuing processing for writing electronic ticket information into the information storage chip based on the ticket issuing information, said ticket issuing information being registered in the electronic ticket distribution authentication apparatus based on the generated ticket information master.

Independent claim 52 is directed to an electronic ticket management system using an information storage chip for storing electronic ticket information which authenticates a right to attend a specific event, the electronic ticket management system having: an electronic ticket information forming unit for forming event information unique to each event, and for generating electronic ticket information in correspondence with event information, said electronic ticket information forming unit further generating an electronic ticket information master based on the event information; an electronic ticket information writer for writing the electronic ticket information into the information storage chip via Internet, said electronic ticket information further including a plurality of attendee information; and an electronic ticket information reader installed at an event venue corresponding to the event information, wherein said ticket information reader performs distribution authentication processing for determining whether the electronic ticket information is to be distributed to a user of the information storage chip based on the generated electronic ticket information master, and registers an authentication result in the electronic ticket information writer as ticket issuing information.

Applicants believe that Laval fails to disclose or suggest at least a number of features of the claimed invention. For example, Applicants believe that Laval at least fails to disclose that the invention described in Laval distributes electronic ticket information via the Internet. In fact, Laval teaches away from same. For example, Laval discloses that the invention is directed to managing admission to an attraction. The invention provides a customer with a choice of standing in line for the attraction or having a spot reserved for admission later without standing

Appl. No. 10/032,184
Reply to Office Action of July 19, 2005

in line. See, Laval, column 3, lines 44-48. The invention in Laval provides two access points or queues at an attraction. In the first queue, customers line up in a traditional line waiting for the next available chance to use the attraction. The second queue provides a customer with access to the attraction which avoids the traditional, first queue. See, Laval, column 3, lines 55-60. To avoid the first queue in Laval, a customer may access a second queue, where they are assigned a future time for accessing the attraction. The customer, at the designated later time returns to the attraction, where the system validates the entitlement of the customer allowing them access at that assigned time. Further, a customer may be issued a pass at the second queue entitling the customer to access the attraction at a future time. The customer uses the pass to establish entitlement to access the attraction at the future time. In this regard, the customer may leave the vicinity of the attraction between when the pass is issued and the future time at which the customer is entitled to access to the attraction. See, Laval, column 4, lines 8-22. Accordingly, a customer seeking to gain admission to an attraction utilizing the invention as disclosed in Laval would be required to wait in a first queue until they are the next customer. In the alternative, the customer may arrive at the attraction, go to the second queue, receive a predetermined later time and return at that time to gain admission to the attraction without waiting in line.

Clearly, Laval, which is directed to the admission to an attraction as discussed above, is distinguishable from the claimed invention which is directed to electronic ticket management and electronic ticket distribution authentication that is capable of distributing electronic ticket information via the Internet as fully supported by the Specification, for example at page 20, lines 13-16. Moreover, the electronic ticket distribution via the Internet allows for electronic tickets to be sold via store terminals, such as a multimedia kiosk terminal installed in a ticket store or a convenience store. See, Specification, page 20, lines 17-20.

Accordingly, the claimed invention is clearly distinguishable from Laval. For example, a customer utilizing the claimed invention would not have to arrive at an attraction, interact with a second queue, receive a designated later time to return and return at that time to gain admission. The customer utilizing the claimed invention could receive their electronic ticket information from a remote location such as their house, store or other remote locations and arrive at the attraction to gain admission at the proper time. Thus, a customer utilizing the claimed invention would not have to first arrive at the attraction to determine what later time to return to the

Appl. No. 10/032,184
Reply to Office Action of July 19, 2005

attraction in order to gain admission without waiting in a queue. Indeed, the customer in Laval would still have to wait to gain admission to an attraction. While they may be able to "leave the vicinity of the attraction between when the pass is issued and the future time at which the customer is entitled to access the attraction," they are still required to wait from the time they arrived at the attraction until the time they can access it. This contrasts the claimed invention where a customer does not need to first arrive at the attraction.

Therefore, Laval on its own is clearly deficient with respect to the claimed invention. Based on at least these reasons, Applicant believes that Laval is distinguishable from the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the anticipation rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 14-18, 52 and 61-63 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laval in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,216,227 to Goldstein et al. ("Goldstein"). Thus, the Patent Office primarily relies on Laval and further relies on the Goldstein reference to remedy the deficiencies of same. Applicants believe that this rejection is improper and further the combination of Laval and Goldstein is distinguishable from the claimed invention as defined by claims 1, 14-18, 52 and 61-63.

For the reasons discussed above, Applicants believe that the combination of Laval and Goldstein fails to render obvious claims 1, 14-18, 52 and 61-63, where the Patent Office relies on Goldstein for an "event information includes a seat master concerning seat information." See, Office Action, page 4. At a minimum, the cited art fails to teach or suggest the features of claims 1, 14-18, 52 and 61-63 based on at least the above reasons discussed above where Goldstein cannot be relied on solely to remedy the deficiencies of same.

Appl. No. 10/032,184

Reply to Office Action of July 19, 2005

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and earnestly solicit reconsideration of same.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

Thomas C. Basso

Reg. No. 46,541

Customer No. 46,541

Dated: August 18, 2005